

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Claims 9-14 have been added. The added claims 9-14 correspond to amended claims 1-6. Thus, Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

Specification

Applicant submits an amended paragraph [0002] as requested by the Examiner.

Claim objections:

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 2 for reciting unclear terms. Even though Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner, to further prosecution, Applicant amended these claims to more clearly define what Applicant considers as patentable subject matter. To this end, the term “point” has been replaced with “node” as defined in paragraph [0027] and [0028]. The term “entity” has been replaced with the term “variable” as defined in paragraph [0026].

Claim Rejection under 35 USC §101

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 USC §101 for failing to be directed to a statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The present invention is directed to a method of performing a technical simulation. In particular, the present invention provides for an extremely flexible modular system which can be easily integrated into automation systems to simulate automation processes or other technical processes. Thus, the simulation method according to the present invention allows for an easy integration into, for example, complex automation systems, and thus, costs in developing complex systems can be reduced. Applicant amended claim 1 to more clearly recite that the simulation method relates to a technical application as described in the specification of the present application. Thus, the subject matter as defined in independent claim 1 is useful, tangible, and concrete.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Schwarz et al. Applicant substantially amended the independent claims to more clearly define the invention. The Examiner stated, in particular, that Schwarz discloses all the limitations of independent claim 1 on page 59, Figure 12 and the first set of matrix equations. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The present invention relates to a unique way of performing a simulation by providing a plurality of vector models and defining each vector model in a specific way that allows the forming of a universal library. To this end, each vector model comprises at least a first node which is fed with a first variable and a plurality of second nodes which outputs a second variable. The second nodes are further divided into two categories wherein the first category includes nodes that only output the second variable and the second category includes nodes that output the second variable and are fed with the first variable.

Schwarz does not disclose or suggest such a vector model. On the contrary, figure 12 clearly shows that the end points of the beam have only a simply input node and an output node. Moreover, the whole document always distinguishes clearly between input and output nodes. A combined input and output node as defined in the present independent claim 1 is not present. The matrix according to Schwarz is merely used to define the three-dimensional relationship within the transfer function to generate the respective three-dimensional resulting forces. However, there is no plurality of second nodes with two different type of nodes as defined in the independent claim 1. Thus, Schwarz does not anticipate the present invention.

Dependent claims

The Examiner further rejected claims 3-6 under USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwarz in view of Teng et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As stated above Schwarz does neither disclose nor suggest the limitations of independent claim 1. The dependent claims include all the limitations of independent claim 1 and are, thus, patentable at least to the extent of the independent claim. Therefore, Applicant would like to defer any reasoning with respect to these claims until the independent claim allowed.

SUMMARY


In light of the above remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is respectfully requested. It is further submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and early notice of the same is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments or suggestions in furtherance of the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the agent of record by telephone or facsimile.

Applicants do not believe that any other fees are due at this time; however, should any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 to 1.21 be required for any reason relating to this document, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct the fees from Deposit Account No. 02-0383, (*formerly Baker & Botts, L.L.P.*) Order Number 071308.0217.

Respectfully submitted:

BAKER BOTTS, L.L.P.

Date: November 29, 2004

By: 
Andreas H. Grubert
(Limited recognition 37 C.F.R. §10.9)
One Shell Plaza
910 Louisiana Street
Houston, Texas 77002-4995
Telephone: 713.229.1964
Facsimile: 713.229.7764
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS